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1. **BACK GROUND**

The Lutheran World Federation, World Service (LWF-WS) South Sudan Program has been operational in the country since 2004. Currently, LWF-WS works in three of the former ten states, namely Jonglei, Upper Nile, and Unity. In Jonglei, LWF-WS’ emergency response to the protracted crisis since 2013 has covered interventions in support in the areas of shelter, non-food items, food security (mainly through cash transfers and support for agricultural production), WASH, and education for internally displaced persons, returnees and host communities.

In Ruweng State (newly curved out of former Unity state), LWF/WS largely supports Sudanese Refugees in AjuongThok and Pamir Camps. In all its operations, LWF/ WS work in collaboration with local authorities and community structures. In response to the 2017 famine through an Actalliance Appeal SSD 171, LWF has implemented a 12 Months Cash Based emergency response project ending March, 2018. The project aimed to address the acute humanitarian needs among host communities Panriang County/ Ruweng State.

**Project Title:** Famine Crisis Response in South Sudan

**Project Overall Goal:** To save lives of famine and conflict affected populations in South Sudan and increase resilience to future disasters

**Outcome 1:** Food Security and Livelihoods

* Improved access to food for crisis affected populations (Target: 3,500 households)

**Outcome 2:** Education (EiE) & Psychosocial Support

* Improved retention of pupils and teachers in 7 schools in Pariang County.

1. **OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact/outcome, coverage and stakeholder perspective as well as connectedness and ‘sustainability ‘of the emergency response project and to document good practices and lessons learnt during the implementation of the project. Areas related to accountability to communities affected by crisis are also included. The evaluation is, therefore, expected to consider both the accountability and learning aspects.

**2.2Scope and Key Evaluation Questions**

***Relevance and Appropriateness***

* Was the choice of using mainly cash rather than in-kind assistance justified in terms of needs, availability and functionality of markets, and beneficiary households’ preferences? If preferences of different groups differ (data disaggregation), what is the reason?
* To what extent did beneficiary selection criteria complement the targeting of other humanitarian assistance provided in the area? Were there any significant gaps for particular community groups?
* Was the size and frequency of the transfer adequate?
* Was implementation seasonally aligned?

***Effectiveness***

* How timely was the response in relation to the needs of different community groups, seasonality, security challenges, accessibility of the target areas, and comparatively with other humanitarian response actions in the areas? How could timeliness have been improved?
* How well did the targeting mechanism function, what were the (potential) inclusion and exclusion errors (by design and through implementation), and what tensions were caused, if any?
* How effective were the delivery processes for the cash payments especially from the beneficiaries’ perspective?
* To what extent were the three aforementioned results of the project achieved and what were the factors within the design of the project and its management that contributed to these achievements?
* How effective was the cooperation with the FSP and how could such cooperation be improved?
* How effective were the processes used by the project team in monitoring the progress of the project implementation to establish achievements are made against all the output and outcome indicators?

***Outcome / Impact***

*The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The evaluation should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of trade and financial conditions. The assessment of impact for this project is expected to cover the social, economic (impact on local markets, prices, supply levels, vendors), etc. aspects.*

* How did beneficiaries use the funds?
* What were the changes seen in the lives of the beneficiary households attributable to the project?
* Which negative coping mechanisms have been avoided or reduced due to the support provided through the project?
* To what extent (including for how long and to which degree) were vulnerable unconditional cash transfer beneficiary households able to meet their nutritional and other basic needs during critical periods?
* What evidence is there of the impact that the response has had on beneficiaries? (including number of people affected)
* What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
* What psychological effects has the response had (e.g. do beneficiaries feel dignified, empowered, trusted and respected du to use of cash)?
* What are the unintended changes, positive or negative, that have stemmed from the response? (e.g. explore household or community tensions due to receiving/ not receiving cash as well as decision making power dynamics in the household),
* Were there any unintended results around security to do with cash for beneficiaries?

***Coverage and stakeholder perspective (including protection concerns).*** *The need to reach major population groups facing life-threatening risk wherever they are*

* Who was supported by the humanitarian interventions? Which groups were targeted and which were not?
* Was the response well-coordinated with the cash working group? If not what were the barriers or challenges?
* Was the response well-coordinated with other NGOs implementing cash in the area, if any, in order to avoid duplication?
* Have all of those in need of protection been given adequate consideration?
* What linkages have been made to address protection needs or to refer cases onwards for specialised assistance beyond cash? What gaps remain?
* What do the beneficiaries think of the response (Its relevance, appropriateness and outcomes)?
* Do beneficiaries find the vulnerability criteria fair and transparent (do they know why they were selected)? Are any groups missed out in their opinion?
* What is the perspective of other primary and secondary stakeholders (e.g. staff, community leadership, local government officials, UN)? Have the most vulnerable been reached? Is the targeting appropriate for the context and needs?

***Efficiency***

* How efficient were delivery processes, considering the time and resources required during implementation?
* How cost-effective were the modalities used by the project compared to other modalities?
* Were the financial resources made available realistic for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs?
* Has enough time been allocated for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs?
* Were there enough staff, of appropriate competency, for the achievement of the intended objective and outputs?
* Are there appropriate financial systems in place?
* Are there appropriate logistics system and other support systems (e.g. HR) in place?
* Was the selected service provider (the company that was delivering cash) good value for money?

***Connectedness and ‘sustainability’***

* How has local capacity been supported and developed through the response to contribute to sustainability? What additional support is required?
* What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?
* What influence did already existing networks have (e.g. national and international non-governmental organisations) on the implemented interventions? Which lessons learnt could be relevant for others?
* Does a sensible exit strategy exist including schedule and guidelines for the transfer of responsibility and activities to government departments and/or development organisations? Is there a budget scenario for the time after the assistance?

***Accountability***

* What mechanisms and processes were used to disseminate relevant project information to beneficiaries and other concerned stakeholders? How effective were the mechanisms in terms of coverage and ensuring beneficiary knowledge of the project?
* To what extent did the beneficiary households know their rights and entitlements in relation to the project?
* Were beneficiary households aware of their right to provide feedback and complain in case of any irregularities and that their complaints would be welcomed and addressed? What system was in place at the community level to ensure that? What was the role of the community level cash committees in relation to this? What was the level of utilization of this mechanism (e.g. cases recorded per month)? How satisfied were the affected communities with the mechanism?
* Was there a process in place to receive process and resolve complaints? What were some key findings and lessons learnt on this aspect?
* To what extent was information obtained from post distribution monitoring (PDM) activities during the course of implementation used to make adjustments, if any? What gaps exist or improvements could be made for future projects?
* What collaboration and coordination mechanisms were adopted during the implementation of the project and to what extent have such mechanisms added value?

***Key Lessons learnt***

* What are the key good practices and lessons learnt from the interventions, as well as the practices in the project areas and among beneficiaries in relation to targeting criteria, transfer modality and delivery mechanism, conditionality, seasonality, security, gender relations, the influence (positive and negative) of existing community structures, coping mechanisms and the impact of the project on local markets? These need to be highlighted with concrete recommendations for future interventions.
* What should be repeated and developed for the next phase of the project? What should not be repeated the next time?
* How did the financial service provider perform and are there any key lessons for the employment of such FSP (e.g. improvements to contractual arrangement etc.?
* Organisationally, what lessons can be learnt from the cash interventions for LWF?
* What are the learnings from a Do-no-Harm perspective? Were there any incidences of conflict on any level with regards to the distribution of cash to selected beneficiaries (HH level, intra- and inter-communal level)? Were there any protection issues recorded and what would be lessons learnt from that?

1. **EVALUATION METHODS AND TOOLS**

The evaluation will be conducted by an external consultant who will develop evaluation methods and data collection tools for discussion with and approval by the LWF program team prior to the actual evaluation work. The consultant shall also provide LWF with an inception report, containing an overview of their understanding of the assignment, time schedule (considering the timeline given below), and planned activities, proposed methods and tools as well as how final results will be presented.

The evaluation approach should be participatory to ensure active involvement of target beneficiaries, local authorities, cash committees, other key stakeholders and the relevant LWF staffs.

Among others, however, the evaluation is expected to employ the following methods:

* Desk review of secondary data (proposals, reports and previous studies)
* Interviews/ Focus Group Discussions with beneficiaries (including disaggregation by gender)
* Visits to selected project sites
* Interviews with other stakeholders (e.g. local authorities, donors, other NGOs, UN, non-beneficiaries)

Methodologically, it is important to include a zero-group in collecting data, a control-group who was not selected as beneficiaries and who did not receive cash. Project indicators should also be applied to this group, as well as their experiences recorded and compared, e.g. market effects, prices, availability of goods, conflict, other social effects.

All data should be collected and documented in an accessible electronic format as much as possible. Data protection standards need to be followed strictly. Data is to be collected in a disaggregated manner as much as relevant and feasible, especially with regards to Gender, age, location, and other relevant characteristics.

The methods used, quantitative and qualitative elements, and triangulation (also with PDM results) explicitly presented in the analysis section, should deliver evidence regarding the attribution of changes recorded to the specific intervention of LWF referred to here.

1. **DELIVERABLES**

* A technical proposal that covers, among others, the evaluation methodologies and tools (subject to review and approval by LWF prior to the actual evaluation work).
* Short inception report on the proposed evaluation.
* Evaluation work plan and budget based on the estimated period detailed under section 6 below.
* Data collection tools and results.
* A PowerPoint debriefing on evaluation findings and recommendations in the field and Juba.
* Draft report. LWF will provide inputs to the draft report.
* Final report (to be approved by LWF) after provision of comments/inputs on the draft report. The final report is expected to also provide:
  + Specific conclusion/ recommendations for future implementation/ programming regarding especially vulnerable groups as identified in the description of households
  + Recommendations to improve monitoring
  + Relevant aspects/open questions to consider for future programming

1. **CONSULTANT PROFILE**

The consultant should meet the following criteria:

* Higher university degree in a relevant field with over 10 years’ experience in food security, disaster risk reduction, emergency response and livelihoods programming, including cash based interventions (CBI), in fragile contexts.
* Proven experience in conducting end of project evaluations.
* Sound knowledge/ understanding of community vulnerability, disaster risk reduction, cash-based intervention modalities in emergency response, rights based approaches (RBA) and participatory methodologies.
* Strong understanding of the South Sudan context.
* Excellent written English.
* Knowledge of local languages is an added asset.

1. **TENTATIVE TIMELINE**

The actual evaluation work is expected to begin in the third week of March 2018 and to take up to **14 days.**

Expressions of interest (technical and financial proposals) from competent applicants should be sent to [lwfssd.consultancy@gmail.com](mailto:lwfssd.consultancy@gmail.com). Application should be submitted not later than **12th March, 2018**

Applications will be reviewed on rolling basis

***Child Safe Guarding***

*LWF is a child safe organization and is fully committed to promoting the realization of children’s rights including the right to protection from violence and abuse. We therefore, have particular responsibilities to children we work and come into contact with to keep them safe from any harm or risk. In line with LWF policy, any appointment is contingent on thorough criminal record checks.*